

**Electricity Act 1989**

**Town and Country Planning Act 1997**

**DPEA Code of Practice**

**Tealing to Kintore OHL Project; Lochty Issues by** *Edward Troughton, Kirkside of Lochty, Menmuir, Angus DD9 6RY*

---

Good morning. My name is Edward Troughton. I live at Kirkside of Lochty [Kirkside], which is positioned on Section B Route 4A. It is situated at one of the tightest pinch points on the whole line between Kirkside and the line of 8 Lochty cottages. [\[See Appendix A\]](#). I am here to argue as plainly as possible, point by point, why TKUP 400kV OHL and specifically Route 4a should not be given approval to proceed.

Whilst I understand the need for efficient energy transmission, I cannot support the applicant that so publicly pledges a “Just and Fair Transition” and then runs such a deeply flawed project. It is a process that has been rushed, that has been careless in the facts presented and has been grossly dismissive of the people and places it harms.

So: point by point.

**First: steel structure pylons are already obsolete.** A report published by the University of Cambridge and the Institute of Physics in November 2025 identifies high-temperature superconducting cables as a proven alternative to OHL. These cables carry the same power underground, with near-zero energy loss and no visual impact. Projects in Germany, the USA, and Asia are already operating at scale. The UK grid currently loses up to 10% of generated electricity (worth up to £3.75bn pa) as heat through conventional lines. Before committing our communities to these outdated steel structures we ask you to reconsider. What a tragedy if this ‘industrial scale destruction’ is allowed to happen when better technology is available.

**Second: Section B. Route 4A was pushed upon the tightknit community it deeply affects.** It did not exist until August 2024. The applicant’s preferred route had always been to the south of the corridor but after (understandable) lobbying by residents in the Careston area, the line moved precipitously north to land at Route 4a. At the same time widening the corridor to take in farms and residences that hadn’t even been in it prior to this. We were given only a few months to recover from the shock and respond. It was a macabre game of musical chairs, and residents on Route 4A were left standing. [\[Note Appendix B evidence: SSEN LT455](#)

[Consultation Document page 40 and SSEN ROC January 2025 page 72](#) ] The Careston community were clearly protected at the expense of the Blackhall, Lochty, Dunswood to Fern community.

**Third: it bisects a community.** Tower 111 would sit between Kirkside and the eight Lochty Cottages — recognised by the applicants as a severe pinch point. Lochty cottages quite clearly have spectacular northerly views towards the Caterthuns; views across open countryside that would be entirely blighted. The applicant dismisses the impact because the ‘front’ of the cottages face south, deliberately ignoring that the picture windows and gardens face north. That is not oversight. That is dishonesty in the assessment.

**Fourth: it destroys irreplaceable woodland.** A 90-metre swathe cutting through Lochty Wood, Dunswood, Belliehill, and Boggie Woods: Long Established woodland of Plantation Origin. *NPF4 Policy 6 explicitly states that loss of such woodland cannot be supported. Once felled, it is gone forever.*

**Fifth: it breaches multiple other NPF4 policies.** Independent review by Ness Planning, our advisor, finds *Route 4A in direct conflict with Policy 3 on biodiversity, Policy 4 on natural places, Policy 6 on woodland, Policy 11 on energy development impacts, and Policy 14 on design and place.* These policies were put in to protect us. The fact that they are being ignored is wilful bad practice.

**Sixth: the environmental assessment is flawed.** The Residential Visual Amenity Assessment records Kirkside as facing north-east. The front aspect does but the main part of the house faces south-west. The RVAA was either desk based or conducted from a car and missed this important fact. Best practice requires a four-part assessment including a visit to the property. This was not done. The applicant’s own noise data places Kirkside of Lochty garden approximately 165 metres from Tower S111 [[Volume 5: Appendix 15.4 Operational Noise Impact](#)].

**Seventh: the consultation has been utterly woeful.** At our first meeting in 2023, an SSEN staff member told my wife: *“We’re making them tall so we don’t fry your hair.”* A letter to the board of SSEN remains unanswered – one of many pieces of correspondences ignored. We have been spoken at, not listened to. Owners of residential properties such as those at Kirkside and Lochty Cottages have been treated with disdain.

**Eighth: a viable alternative exists and is being ignored.** Alternative route 4F, developed with community input and assessed by independent consultants, involves a 0.75k deviation. It avoids LEPO woodland. It reduces directly affected dwellings within 100 metres from seven to two. It protects both Careston and Lochty communities. It complies with NPF4 and yet the applicant has refused to properly consider it.

I submit three videos showing pink-foot geese on Route 4A feeding and roosting in numbers. Filmed from Kirkside garden and from Lochty Cottages in Winter 2025, these give the actual ecological evidence the applicant's assessment has failed to capture. The applicant says there is little evidence of geese activity in the area [*Volume 5 Appendix 12.3 Shadow Habitats Regulation*].

If this destructive infrastructure were allowed to proceed then our communities bear all the risk. The risk of loss of amenity, health, property value, and most importantly loss of a way of life. Some will accrue compensation; homeowners receive nothing, when it is estimated that property values could lose up to 40% in value. **This is not a just or fair transition.** It is the opposite.

**Withhold consent for Route 4A.** I urge the reporters to require **all** alternatives to be fully and fairly assessed. The applicant has been playing with people's lives from desktops like a computer game. For those living under the threat of these monstrosities it is certainly no game and it is not just a line on a map. It is our homes, our livelihoods and the very heart of the Scottish East Coast. If this allowed to progress there is no going back - it cannot be changed back.

---

### **Supporting Video Evidence**

The following videos are submitted as evidence of migratory geese on Route 4A:

**Video 1:** Geese at Kirkside of Lochty, 25 November 2025

<https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/9l7ip0vu37xkw2kdoerxu/Geese-at-Kirkside-of-Lochty-25-Nov-2025.mov?rlkey=cynzhea0ciglffys8bt8uum9s&st=y95tgr01&dl=0>

**Video 2:** Geese at Kirkside of Lochty, 23 October 2025

<https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/jqdu67yrak0xfvbzq4vdh/Geese-Kirkside-of-Lochty-23.10.25.mov?rlkey=wo3x97xcr4earuq0uiou1ddkd&st=eco7s1u0&dl=0>

**Video 3:** Geese at Lochty with Caterthuns backdrop, 23 October 2025

<https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/8i5otb2fv8mhtjh6kon/Geese-Lochty.-Caterthuns-backdrop-23.10.25.mov?rlkey=m70f5j08sczgjxbc7g5bxjpxj&st=6dw2nobo&dl=0>

---

## Reference

University of Cambridge / Institute of Physics (November 2025), "From gridlock to grid power: how to get renewable energy where it's needed in the UK."

<https://www.cam.ac.uk/research/news/from-gridlock-to-grid-power-how-to-get-renewable-energy-where-its-needed-in-the-uk>

## APPENDIX A



## APPENDIX B

Location 4: Careston

The development of an alignment in the area from Baldoukie to Nether Belliehill encountered a variety of constraints that have restricted the design of a single optimal alignment for the OHL in this section. Consultation responses regarding the proximity of the southern edge of the route (B1.1) boundary encouraged alternative alignments to be explored further north than the proposed route section, which would provide greater separation of the OHL from community areas. Alongside cultural heritage constraints presented by scheduled monuments at Vayne Castle, Careston Castle and Windsor Cairn, key issues which constrained identification of a single feasible alignment included agricultural and agri-tech operations, residential properties (especially those at the Careston settlement), wet woodland, semi-natural woodland and commercial forestry areas, complex hydrology and an LNCS. Five alternative alignments were developed in this area to manage these constraints and were taken forward for more detailed appraisal (see Plate 5.4 and Figures 5.10 to 5.12 in Appendix K). The alternative alignments are briefly described below.

**Our Response**

- Proximity to property (within approximately 300 m of the alignment LoDs) has been reconfirmed and the Potential Alignment 4a is constrained by a slightly greater number of properties than the other alternative alignments. However, it provides the opportunity to maintain a greater distance between the OHL and residential properties, particularly around the groups of properties in the area of Careston. The OHL alignment will be developed to maintain a target separation distance of at least 170 m from properties wherever possible, taking account of all relevant constraints.
- There is a clear difference in landscape and visual constraints, with Alternative Alignments 4c and 4e least preferred due largely to their alignment over a prominent and elevated ridge feature. Alternative Alignment 4b is considered to be more visually constrained than Alternative Alignment 4d and the Potential Alignment 4a due to its proximity and wrapping around receptors at Montboy.
- All of the alternative alignments would require some loss of woodlands including areas designated as LEPO associated with riparian planting at watercourse crossings and the woodlands at Duns Wood and Lochty Wood. The Potential Alignment 4a would intersect part of Lochty Wood and is more constrained in this location than the comparable Alternative Alignments 4b and 4d; however, it is considered that groundwater dependent habitats associated with the woodland area could be avoided or mitigated. Alternative Alignment 4d also intersects part of Barrelwell Bog LNCS which can be avoided with the Potential Alignment 4a. The OHL design will be developed to minimise mature woodland